

Tunku Shamsul Bawrin
 Head of Geography Department,
 University of Malaya.

As every body knows, Malaysia has been undergoing a high degree of mobility. For various reasons, people have been moving from rural areas to urban areas. One of these changes is the movement of people from rural areas to urban areas. They move from the rural areas to the urban areas for various reasons. Transfers from a rural area to an urban area.

The pattern of migration, however, is not the same as in the 1970 census. Still reside in rural areas. The pattern of migration is not the same as in the 1970 census. There were 22,700 people who had moved from rural areas to urban areas in Peninsular Malaysia. Only 22 per cent of the total population in urban areas with 10,000 or more inhabitants, and 22 per cent of the total population. Despite the latter's numerical significance, migration, because of financial and time constraints, is not the same as in the 1970 census. Possibly this is also because the pattern of migration is not the same as in the 1970 census.

RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION IN MALAYSIA:

IN SEARCH OF A BETTER LIFE?

BY

TUNKU SHAMSUL BAWRIN

HEAD OF GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT,
 UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA.

On the subject of migration, it is well known that rural-urban migration is a common phenomenon in many countries. These issues are usually those to the political and administrative heads of power, especially those problems that are faced by the Federal and State capital cities. These issues are also being articulated. In that as it may, much of the research carried out so far has been descriptive and there is, as yet, no comprehensive data available on the extent and spread of rural-urban migration in Malaysia.

RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION IN MALAYSIA:

IN SEARCH OF A BETTER LIFE?

As indicated earlier, only 38 per cent of the total life-time

By

Tunku Shamsul Bahrin
Department of Geography,
University of Malaya.

As never before, Malaysians are registering a high degree of mobility. For various reasons, are changing their places of residence. Some of these changes may be said to take place within the same context, i.e. they move from one rural area to another, but others involve transfers from a rural setting to an urban one.

The patterns of internal migration reveal that more migrants still reside in rural areas than towns. At the time of the 1970 census, there were 953,700 lifetime internal migrants in Peninsular Malaysia, only 38 per cent of whom were enumerated in urban areas with 10,000 or more inhabitants, and 62 per cent in rural areas. Despite the latter's numerical significance, researchers, because of financial and time constraints, tend to give less attention to them. Possibly this is also because the phenomenon of migration to the rural areas is considered more routine and is definitely less emotive.

On the other hand, many studies are devoted to rural-urban migrations. A reason could be that the resultant issues are usually close to the political and administrative seats of power, especially those problems that are found in the Federal and State capital cities. These issues are also better articulated. Be that as it may, much of the research carried out so far have been repetitive and there is, as yet, no comprehensive data available on the extent and spread of rural-urban migration in Malaysia.

THE DIMENSION OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION

As indicated earlier, only 38 per cent of the total life-time migrants in the peninsula are found in urban areas in 1970 where they form 37 per cent of the combined population of the 9 major towns in Malaysia. From available figures, the overall pattern is one of highly concentrated in-migration into a few selective urban areas such as Kuala Lumpur where 42 per cent of its population in 1970 were previous residence migrants. Comparative data for some of the other major towns in the peninsula can be seen in Table 1. In relation to their respective

TABLE 1 MIGRATION TO MAJOR TOWNS, 1970

TOWN	1970 POPULATION	PREVIOUS RESIDENT MIGRANTS	PERCENTAGE
Kuala Lumpur & Petaling Jaya	593,777	250,887	42.2
George Town	267,924	70,900	26.5
Ipoh	247,097	86,326	34.9
Johor Bahru	134,480	60,492	45.0
Klang	113,528	38,805	34.2
Melaka	86,253	20,331	23.6
Seremban	80,364	26,692	33.2
Alor Setar	64,759	23,030	35.6
Kuantan	42,824	20,057	46.8
T O T A L	1,631,006	597,500	37.0

Based on R. Pryor, (ed), Migration and Development in Southeast Asia, Table 7.4, p. 94.

populations, Kuantan and Johore Bahru also have high percentages of previous residence migrants. It must be remembered that these are life-time migrants and not all of them came from rural areas in the

peninsula. Whilst some came from other urban centres, the data also included a large number of those born overseas. In George Town and Malacca, these comprised over 50 per cent of the 'previous residence' migrants. What can be concluded is that even a decade ago there is no sign of substantial population redistribution from rural to urban areas.¹

During the 1947-57 inter-censal period, urban growth was explained almost equally by natural increase, migration, and the reclassification of population as urban in 1957. Over the period 1957-70, natural increase assumed a dominant role, accounting for 61 per cent of urban growth, and migration accounted for less than one-fifth of the growth. During this period, the role of migration in urban growth varied considerably between States, but only Selangor benefited significantly. Natural increase was most important in Penang and Kedah and reclassification was an important factor in Kuantan and Trengganu. Penang, Malacca and Kedah apparently lost population from urban areas, but this was more than compensated for by natural increase.²

Urban growth can thus be construed as a relatively recent feature in Peninsular Malaysia. Between 1957 and 1970, the population living in gazetted areas with 10,000 or more inhabitants grew at the compound rate of 3.2 per cent per annum, in contrast to the remaining 'rural' population which grew at 2.4 per cent, giving an overall growth rate of 2.6 per cent. If calculations are based on the 1957 gazetted areas only, excluding from consideration towns which crossed the urban size threshold after 1957, then both urban and rural areas have grown at the same rate of 2.6 per cent per annum. From this point of view,

1. Hirshman, C., 'Recent Urbanization Trends in Peninsular Malaysia', *Demography*, Vol. 3, no. 4, 1976, p. 453.

2. Pryor, B., (ed.), *Migration and Development in Southeast Asia*, Kuala Lumpur, 1979, pp. 95-96.

then, significant urbanization has not occurred, or at most it is 'statistical urbanization' only.³ It can even be said that urbanization and urban growth increased considerably only during the seventies. In 1970, urban population accounted for only 28.7 per cent of the total population, by 1975 it was estimated to be 32.0 per cent increasing to 35.1 per cent by 1980. The urban population growth during the past five years was expected to be 4.6 per annum with rural-urban migration accounting for 50 per cent of the increase.⁴ It must also be noted that at this point of time urban development did not feature too prominently in national planning.

Within the context of national policy to restructure society, it would be most pertinent for us to examine the community differential among in-migrants to urban areas. Data, however, is not available for all the towns in the country. Since the Kuala Lumpur region and its environs appear to be the most important destination for such movements, some conclusion could probably be made based on studies there. Of the 66,000 inter-locality migrants who arrived in Kuala Lumpur, Petaling Jaya and Klang between 1960 and 1970, 42 per cent were Chinese, 41 per cent Malays, 16 per cent Indians and one per cent 'Others'. In comparison, migrants arriving 11 or more years before 1970 were made up of 57 per cent Chinese, 23 per cent Malays and 18 per cent Indians, indicating the generally increasing mobility of Malays and of Indians.⁵

From lifetime migration data it has been observed that 23 per cent of the Malays in the above three towns in 1970 had been resident

3. *ibid.*, p. 95.

4. Malaysia, Third Malaysia Plan 1976-80, Kuala Lumpur, 1976, p. 149.

5. Pryor, R. (ed.), op. cit., pp. 107-108.

for less than one year, 37 per cent for 1-5 years and only 16 per cent had been resident for 11 years or more. Of the 99,629 Chinese, 14 per cent had been resident for less than one year, 34 per cent for 1-5 years and 29 per cent for 11 years or more. Finally, of the 30,884 Indians, 15 per cent had been resident for less than one year, 33 per cent for 1-5 years and 27 per cent for 11 years or more. For the Kuala Lumpur district alone, of the 75,893 migrants resident for less than one year, 44 per cent were Malays (37 per cent for 1-5 years), 40 per cent Chinese (46 per cent for 1-5 years) and 13 per cent Indians (14 per cent for 1-5 years).⁶ This is a further evidence of the recency of Malay in-migration, although still only one-third of all in-migrants to Kuala Lumpur are Malays. It must be pointed out that even though the Malay component of in-migrants is below that of its proportion in the overall national population, a relatively higher proportion of them arrived within one year of the 1970 census, a trend which no doubt would be further increased when the results of the 1980 census are produced.

CAUSES FOR RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION

It is common to ascribe for the rural-urban migration in Malaysia to the 'push' rather than 'pull' factors. It has often been remarked that 'one of the most important features of Asian rural-urban migration, (is) the push of people from the countryside to the cities rather than the pull of industrial employment opportunities in urban areas'.⁷ This explanation is usually substantiated with a bleak description of the socio-economic conditions found in the rural areas.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁷ Hauser, Philip H., (ed.), *Urbanization in Asia and the Far East*, UNESCO Research Centre on the Social Implications of Industrialization in Southern Asia, Calcutta, 1957, p. 133.

Those coming from the more congested areas would initially find that their share of their fathers' subdivided small farm (if any) would permanently assure them of a place below the poverty-line. Jobs are usually scarce in those areas. Such rural migrants, however, find that a similar situation exists in the city. Thus rural poverty is replaced by urban poverty. Yet, the process of rural-urban migration goes on and at a considerably faster rate, the fact that such urbanward creating a situation where the simple and popular 'push-pull' hypothesis alone serve to account for the movement. Be that as it may, its simplicity has completely convinced the Malaysian planners as to its applicability.⁸

With the need to reconsider the complete applicability of the 'push-pull' hypothesis for planning purposes, and the inadequacies of research carried out so far to explain this phenomenon of rural-urban migration, we need to look at it from a much wider perspective of social change and economic growth. Despite the common accusation that jobs are difficult to get in the towns and cities, the opportunities are usually better compared to those available in the rural areas. It is this relative differential that attract the rural youth to drift into the towns, especially the larger urban centres. For example, Todaro has analysed the role of economic factors in rural-urban migration, developing a theoretical framework for examining the inter-play of rural-urban wage differentials and urban unemployment levels as factors regulating the rate of rural-urban migration. His model assumes rational decision making on the part of potential migrants; it suggests that individual decision are based on consideration of 'expected' rather than absolute rural-urban wage differentials.⁹

8. Malaysia, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

9. Todaro, Michael P., Internal Migration in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology, and Research Priorities, Geneva, 1976.

analysis Migration occurs because migrants believe that they will be better satisfied in their needs and desires in the new place that they go than in the place from which they have come. The important key-word is 'believe', since migration is the outcome of decisions made by individuals based on what they perceive the objective world to be like rather than on the objective real-world situation. His perception may be erroneous, but that is the one that prompts the movement. It is thus important, at least in the long run, that the migrants' perception of the urban area should be as close to reality as possible. Honest and objective presentation can help towards giving the migrant a better picture of the real urban environment.

IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES OF RURAL-URBAN MIGRATION

The absence of a comprehensive study on the impact and consequences of rural-urban migrations may be explained by the fact that migration studies in this country are directed towards understanding patterns of migration, migrant characteristics, and probably causes of migration most of which record the views expressed at the place of destination and not at the place of origin. Most of our knowledge about impact of the migration phenomena can be derivative i.e. based on findings elsewhere, or deductive, logical assumptions of effects. Since a great deal of attention has been focussed on the areas of destination, the impact and consequences of the drift in the place of origin.

It is not the intention of this paper to examine the more widely known demographic consequences of migration in either the place of origin or area of destination. These would not change during the next decade. It is also not the intention to make predictions of the future because inevitable socio-political changes in the years to come would only make them invalid. It would be appropriate to emphasize that socio-economic

analysis of population based on census data are invariably outdated and as such modifications have to be made in order to make them useful for planning considerations. It would also be timely to caution the danger of isolating the phenomenon of rural-urban migration from the overall process of urbanization and pattern of urban growth in this country. Although it is a significant issue, it is only one of the factors contributing to urbanization. The discussion here will be restricted firstly to a critical examination of the negative consequences normally attributed to urban drift in the towns; a cursory observation on the positive contribution of migration to the urban areas that is usually ignored; its role in the process of restructuring of society, and finally to review the attempts to stem rural-urban migration.

(1) As elsewhere, it is much too often that we blame the ills of the towns on the rural-urban migrants. A close examination of this stereotype statement is indeed timely.

Rural-urban migration has often been condemned for bringing in its wake various economic and social problems such as unemployment and underemployment, shortage of housing leading to squatting and slums, traffic congestion, racial strife, increase in crimes, and health and sanitary problems.¹⁰ There is little doubt that rural-urban migrants do contribute to some of these urban ills, they cannot by any measure be held completely responsible for all of them. This accusation is especially more serious considering the fact that up to 1970 the actual contribution of migration to urban growth was less than 50 per cent. A survey of squatters in Kuala Lumpur carried out in 1973 revealed that

10. Ali bin Isa, 'Kuala Lumpur' in Lauqian (ed.) Rural Urban Migrants and Metropolitan Development, Toronto, 1971, p. 94.

85 per cent, 70 per cent and 88 per cent of the Chinese, Malay and Indians respectively who were squatters have always resided in the capital city inferring that the migrant component is very small.¹¹ All this goes to show that the over-emphasis on slums and squatters in order to understand the phenomena of rural-urban migration in Malaysia has been misplaced. Urban growth due to natural increase is usually absolved of the blame.

What is most disconcerting about such statements is that they are made without substantiating evidence. There exists no study to show exactly what proportion of the unemployed and of crimes which are actually due to such in-migrants. It can even be said that, if many of these migrants are what they are said to be, then they cannot be a burden to the urban society because they do not own cars to congest the roads and neither are they legally accepted to benefit from the social services provided by the authorities. What is more astonishing is that some of these statements are made in the same breath while admitting that 'It is difficult to establish the origin of criminals involved in the city's crimes. Police Headquarter's reports do not indicate their address but only age, sex, racial groups and sentence passed.'¹² The main cause of this extreme conclusion is the result of the over-emphasis on squatter and slum areas as consequences of the drift from the rural areas.

Because of the excessive concern to study the urban poor, biased conclusions are bound to emerge. Greater emphasis should be given to the more positive and constructive contributions and consequences of rural-urban migration. A study of the 'elite' community in the urban areas would probably indicate a relatively big component of people with rural

11. See M.K. Sen, 'Rehousing and Rehabilitation of Squatters and Slum Dwellers with Special Reference to Kuala Lumpur', in Tan Sui Hai and Hanzah Soodat (eds.), Public and Private Housing in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, 1979, pp. 188-189.

12. Ali bin Esa, op. cit., p. 107.

origins. This could probably be surmised from the origins of many of these high-ranking officials residing in Kuala Lumpur.

In the absence of any authoritative study or data, an examination of the place of origin of those persons included in the 1975-1976 'Who's Who in Malaysia' is attempted. Selecting those names under alphabets A and C who give their current address as Kuala Lumpur and Petaling Jaya and who indicate Malaysia as their birthplace the exercise reveals that out of a total of 95, 84 per cent of them were born outside the Kuala Lumpur-Petaling Jaya area. Some of these, no doubt, must have come from other smaller towns. Whereas this crude measure cannot be taken as a reflection of the whole truth, it does indicate that the in-migrants to the towns do make their fair contributions to the development of the city.

(2) To further strengthen the positive contribution of rural-urban migration in Malaysia, especially Kuala Lumpur, an observation on the educational performance of the children of migrants is relevant. Again, although there is no research and hard data to provide evidence, a cursory glance at those students who perform well in the L.C.E., S.P.H. and S.T.P. examinations reveals that a relatively large proportion of them are children of those who have rural origins. Most of the parents, however, are those who are holding high ranking posts in both the public and private sectors and as such they are financially able to not only put their children in the better schools but also provide the necessary inputs to improve their education. There are also indications that a disproportionate number of these students in the residential schools comprise children of personages holding executive positions in urban areas. This is, of course, consistent with their better performances in the above-mentioned examinations. The point that needs to be

Impressed here is that in-migrants to the urban areas not only better themselves economically and socially but also provide the essentials for their children to widen the differential gap with the children of those that have remained in the villages.

There is yet another aspect to this differential in education between migrants and their children from those who have remained behind. It has been observed elsewhere, and recently in Malaysia, that there is an increasing trend to get professionals and intellectuals involved in politics probably with the view that they eventually become elected representatives. It may be relevant to observe that preferences have been given to those who were born in or originated from the various constituencies or even States. This trend is going to increase in the next decade or so. After that, the situation may involve the children of migrants who would neither have the knowledge or sympathy of their ancestral home ground. Their position and influence, by virtue of their parents' standing, would, however, be sufficient for them to be seriously considered. Whereas current and past representatives may genuinely understand and relate with the rural folks, and their aspirations for advancement, the later generation may only possess marginal commitments. It would be most useful, given this increasing trend, to keep a very close watch on the performance of some of the younger and better educated urban-based representatives.

(3) There have been sufficient reports to indicate that rural-urban migrants have, through time, been able to improve their income level as well as to demonstrate their facility for an upward social mobility. What has not been ascertained is whether this improvement is made at the expense of their native urban counterparts. If the effect is minimal, then the common blame laid on them for contributing to urban unemployment needs to be reviewed. As a matter of fact, it can be positively stated

that rural-urban migration has contributed to economic growth and investment in the urban areas. During the past decade or so an increasing number of foreign firms have set up factories in the various Malaysian towns. It must be admitted that they are there because the opportunities to make larger profits exist because our urban wages are comparatively low or have been kept low because of the continuous influx of outside labour. If wages have risen, these firms would definitely have opted for alternative locations, probably in other countries.

(4) It has often been stated that the migrants from the rural areas, being what they are, face a great deal of problems in adapting themselves into the urban society. The concept of 'cultural shock' has often been applied in describing the migrants plight. There are, however, very few studies that have been conducted to examine the adaptation aspect of this phenomenon. A case study in Bandar Maharani indicates strongly that rural-urban migrants are prepared and willing to accommodate themselves to urban values and to behave in a way that is acceptable by the urban norms. This means that the migrants, despite the odds against them, are adaptable to an open and complex urban system.¹³ With increased education and exposure to urban ways, the so-called 'shock' experienced by the migrants would not be a serious issue in the future save possibly for those who come directly from the village to the big cities without prior exposure and friends to cushion off the change. What is more serious in the future is that the too rapid growth of a few cities in the country would have a tremendous effect on the relationships amongst people living in the cities, irrespective of whether they are native urbanites or in-migrants.

13. Hairi Abdullah, 'Rural-urban Migration: A Case Study in Bandar Maharani', in H.M. Dahlan (ed.), The Nascent Malaysian Society, Kuala Lumpur, 1976, p. 155.

The relationship is definitely breaking down and is turning the Malaysian cities into Riesman's 'Lonely Crowd', where associations are confined to impersonal relationships. The mass-media can play an important role in minimising this undesirable consequence of urbanization as experienced elsewhere and in spearheading the setting up of associations so that individuals do not experience any social alienation. Let us not hurry to demolish the physically ugly communal 'chettos' or 'kampongs' that help foster community life in the city and to replace them with massive congested concrete monstrosities inhabited by social recluses.

(5) Despite the difficulties and problems experienced in the past and those to be encountered in the future, rural-urban migration can contribute in the process of restructuring of society in Malaysia. It is the view of this policy that the isolation of one racial group from another favours racial misunderstanding and prejudices, and that redistribution measures leading towards more physical and residential mixings are desirable in achieving national unity. The situation of Malay domination in the rural areas and the non-Malay overconcentration in the urban areas need to be adjusted.

To bring the non-Malays back to the rural areas would go against all known trends of migration in developing countries. Spontaneous movements of urban non-Malays to the rural areas would not be a feature during the next two decades or so. This could only be realized if unpopular punitive interventionist policies are adopted. This would only create more problems. It could thus be said that national unity in Malaysia would not take place in the rural setting where the trend seems to indicate that despite an overall declining population, the dominance of the Malays would still be emphasized. Since more and more are living in the towns, the urban areas would appear to offer better opportunities for

The relationship is definitely breaking down and is turning the Malaysian cities into Riesman's 'Lonely Crowd', where associations are confined to impersonal relationships. The mass-media can play an important role in minimising this undesirable consequence of urbanization as experienced elsewhere and in spearheading the setting up of associations so that individuals do not experience any social alienation. Let us not hurry to demolish the physically only communal 'chettos' or 'kampongs' that help foster community life in the city and to replace them with massive congested concrete monstrosities inhabited by social recluses.

(5) Despite the difficulties and problems experienced in the past and those to be encountered in the future, rural-urban migration can contribute in the process of restructuring of society in Malaysia. It is the view of this policy that the isolation of one racial group from another favours racial misunderstanding and prejudices, and that redistribution measures leading towards more physical and residential mixings are desirable in achieving national unity. The situation of Malay domination in the rural areas and the non-Malay overconcentration in the urban areas need to be adjusted.

To bring the non-Malays back to the rural areas would go against all known trends of migration in developing countries. Spontaneous movements of urban non-Malays to the rural areas would not be a feature during the next two decades or so. This could only be realized if unpopular punitive interventionist policies are adopted. This would only create more problems. It could thus be said that national unity in Malaysia would not take place in the rural setting where the trend seems to indicate that despite an overall declining population, the dominance of the Malays would still be emphasized. Since more and more are living in the towns, the urban areas would appear to offer better opportunities for

racial mixings and to be the 'melting-pot'. This concept of unity could not be achieved just merely by increasing the proportion of Malay urban population, i.e. by creating towns and cities where one particular community continues to dominate numerically. As such, the concept of creating mono-communal growth centres would not be tenable as a solution. It is my contention that the existing big towns would offer better opportunities for achieving racial mixing than the newer planned towns. The mechanism of spontaneous rural-urban migration seems to assist in achieving this objective. We have seen that more and more Malays have been observed to enter the big cities and thus increasingly to reflect the multi-racial composition of our national population. With national unity as the climax of our national development objective, it would be expected that the authorities would try to quicken the process of the migration of Malays to the towns.

Whereas as one would expect a clear-cut national policy, i.e. to encourage rural-urban migration, the situation appears to be confusing. The government stand seems to differ from one ministry to another and sometimes one department's view changes from time to time depending on the issue in question. There is a tendency for those concerned with the problem of labour shortages in the rural areas to discourage out-migration whereas others directly involved in increasing Malay participation in the secondary and tertiary sectors would favour this movement.

In recent years, the appearance of squatters, unemployment in the urban areas and labour shortages in the rural areas, have prompted the government to consider the need to curb rural-urban migration. 'The government will not allow the migration of rural youths to the cities to take up jobs in the industrial sector to the extent that there will be a shortage of labour in the agriculture sector. It has

been observed that large tracts of padi land have been left uncultivated, smallholdings have not been fully worked, rubber plantations lack tappers and oil palm estates are short of harvesters.¹⁴ This statement has far-reaching implications and it is most surprising that the mass-media has not followed it up.

It would be most interesting if a follow up could be made assess the assumption used in stemming rural-urban migration, which agency is being entrusted to stop this movement and to know what mechanisms are being considered to reduce the urban drift and how this can be achieved without interfering with the process of restructuring of society. These are basic questions which require answers not only to explain rural-urban migration but also related issues which have wider implications.

There is also a need to monitor some of the concepts utilized in redistributing urban growth in this country. The basic guideline adopted so far is to reduce the congestion in the primate city through the establishment of more growth centres. 'There is a need to avoid over-concentration on the country's primate city and to manoeuvre the pattern of city-size distribution and the regional distribution of the urban population with the view of creating a more balanced social and economic development of the country as a whole.'¹⁵ The deceleration of the growth of the primate city is almost a universally proclaimed goal in developing countries, regardless of whether the primate city is 10 million or 500,000. Since the justification must vary from one extreme to another, the

14. Statement made by the Deputy Minister for Agriculture as reported in Utusan Malaysia on 10 September 1980.

15. Jones, Gavin, 'Implications of Prospective Urbanization for Development Planning in Southeast Asia', in Kantner, John F., and Lee McCaffrey (eds.), Population and Development in Southeast Asia, Massachusetts, 1975, p. 111.

unanimity of this goal reflects limitation and the herd instinct more than a rational response to analysis of each country's specific problems. Nevertheless, policymakers usually have little difficulty in producing reasons why primate city control should have a dominant place among population distribution goals. It may be consistent with efficiency, equity, reap major political gains, improve environmental quality etc. The equity arguments are open to attack from many directions; the primate city contains large numbers of very poor people who may suffer as a result of redirection of investment or other growth control measures; and if migration to the primate city is controlled, directly or indirectly, thousands of low-income individuals might be denied opportunities for self-betterment. The impact of in-migration rates on the quality of life is dubious, since most of the migrants and the existing urban poor have no access to most urban services and hence there is little question of their contributing to excess effective demand for services. It must also be remembered that an efficient size for a city depends upon its role and functions. Cities are stratified into hierarchies, and each size class in the hierarchy supports the others via a pattern of specialization in goods production and service supply. A settlement pattern of equalized cities would be very inefficient, since the cities would have to be small to supply low order goods and services, and this would rule out the exploitation of scale economies in the production and delivery of high order goods and services. The appropriate policy prescription is not to reduce its size but to improve its efficiency by spatial reorganization and better management. Since a great deal of this search for optimal size of the primate city is related to the problem where primate city policymakers have difficulty in expanding public services to keep pace with the growing population, then this is essentially a problem of

adjustment not of absolute size.¹⁶

This policy of redirecting growth away from the capital city is usually accompanied with proposals to develop new growth centres within the context of regional development planning. Whereas this strategy may be suited to those countries with large population and extensive land area, its suitability in Malaysia may be limited in view of our relatively small population and area. It may be worth remembering that we already have hundreds of towns located throughout the country and some of these have actually stagnated.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Until the seventies rural-urban migration had played a relatively minor role in the growth of urban population in Malaysia, but evidence seems to point to its increasing contribution which can be expected to be accentuated in the eighties. This trend was already evident by 1970. Migration is a response to the perceived socio-economic differentials between the urban and rural areas and government activities after 1970 have aimed at improving the urban environment. These have definitely had the effect of influencing the migrants' perception of the urban centres as their destinations and an increased in-migration becomes inevitable. Although there is no adequate data to substantiate the dimension of this increase, even cursory observations can confirm the expanded volume of the movement especially to some of the bigger urban settlements. The 1980 census will provide definitive data on the contribution of rural-urban migration to urban growth. The phenomenon of urban in-migration cannot be isolated from the overall process and problems of urbanization, which

16. Richardson, H.V., 'Defining Population Distribution Goals in Development Planning', Paper presented at the United Nations Workshop on Population Distribution Policies in Development Planning, Bangkok, 1979, pp. 12-16.

have become only too real. The mass-media should emphasize their role as a communicator between the planners and those who are the so-called beneficiaries of plannings. They should begin to express more the views of the people and reduce the practice of reporting handout statements of advancements and successes. These need to be verified on the ground and assessed within the context of national objectives and problems. The pursuit of a better life in the urban centres should not be assumed to be attended only with 'ills'. Perhaps with honesty and imagination, all parties concerned can still effect a situation where hopefully the migrational process can be fully realized as both a tool and an end in the achievement of national development objectives.